arXiv:1208.2200v1 [math.PR] 10 Aug 2012

OPTIMUM BOUNDS FOR THE DISTRIBUTIONS OF MARTINGALES IN BANACH SPACES[1]

BY IOSIF PINELIS

Michigan Technological University

A general device is proposed, which provides for extension of exponential inequalities for sums of independent real-valued random variables to those for martingales in the 2-smooth Banach spaces. This is used to obtain optimum bounds of the Rosenthal-Burkholder and Chung types on moments of the martingales in the 2-smooth Banach spaces. In turn, it leads to best-order bounds on moments of the sums of independent random vectors in any separable Banach spaces. Although the emphasis is put on the infinite-dimensional martingales, most of the results seem to be new even for the one-dimensional ones. Moreover, the bounds on the Rosenthal-Burkholder type of moments seem to be to certain extent new even for the sums of independent real-valued random variables. Analogous inequalities for (one-dimensional) supermartingales are given.

1. Introduction.

For a separable Banach space $(X\|\cdot\|)$, let $\mathcal{S}(X)$ denote the class of all "stopped" sequences $f=(f_j)=(f_0,f_1,\dots,f_n,f_n,f_n,\dots)$ of Bochner-integrable random vectors in X with $f_0\equiv 0$, probability space (Ω,F,P) and adapted to a non-decreasing sequence $(F_j)=(F_0,F_1,\dots)$ of sub-σ-fields of F; here, n, (Ω,F,P) and (F_j) are considered attributes of f and may be different for different $f\in\mathcal{S}(X)$. We also put $f_\infty=f_n$ for $f\in\mathcal{S}(X)$.

We restrict the forthcoming consideration to that of the stopped sequences with the only purpose of simplifying the wording. Also, the results can be easily extended to any measurable seminormed spaces X.

For $f\in S(X)$, put $f^*=\sup\{\|f_j\|\colon\ j=0,1,\dots\}$, $d_0=d_0(f)\equiv 0$, $d_j=d_j(f)=f_j-f_{j-1}$, $j=1,2,\dots$, $s=s(f)=\left(\sum_{j=1}^\infty E_{j-1}\|d_j\|^2\right)^{1/2}$, where E_{j-1} stands for the conditional expectation given F_{j-1}, $S_p=S_p(f)=\left(\sum_{j=1}^\infty \|d_j\|^p\right)^{1/p}$, $p>0$ $S=S(f)=S_2(f)$.

Let $\mathcal{M}(X)$ stand for the class of all sequences $(f_j)\in\mathcal{L}(X)$ that are martingales and $\mathcal{M}_{ind}(X)$, for the class of all sequences $(f_j)\in\mathcal{L}(X)$ having independent increments d_j's.

For any two nonnegative expressions $\mathcal{E}_1$ and $\mathcal{E}_2$, let us write $\mathcal{E}_1<\mathcal{E}_2$ (or, equivalently, $\mathcal{E}_2>\mathcal{E}_1$) if $\mathcal{E}_1\le A\mathcal{E}_2$, and $\mathcal{E}_1\asymp\mathcal{E}_2$ if $\mathcal{E}_1<\mathcal{E}_2<\mathcal{E}_1$. Here and in

[1]Research partially supported by NSF grant DMS-8921369.

AMS 1980 subject classifications. 60B12, 60E15, 60G42, 60G50, 60F10.

Key words and phrases. Distribution inequalities, exponential inequalities, bounds on moments, martingales in Banach spaces, 2-smooth Banach spaces, sums of independent random variables.

what follows, A denotes different positive absolute constants.

In this paper, when we speak about optimum bounds, we mean the optimality to the equivalence $\asymp$.

We assume that $\inf \phi = \infty$, $\sup \phi = 0$, $\sum\limits_{j\in\emptyset} u_j = 0$, $\prod\limits_{j\in\emptyset} u_j = 1$.

In section 2, we introduce a class of Banach spaces, here 2-smooth, which is a subclass of the class of the Banach space of type 2. It is shown that, e..g, L^p, $p \geq 2$, are 2-smooth.

In section 4, a device is suggested, which provides for extension of exponential inequalities for the sums of independent real-valued random variables to those for martingales in the 2-smooth Banach spaces. In particular, by that means an exponential inequality for the martingales in the 2-smooth spaces, optimal in terms of $|||d^*|||_\infty$, $|||s_2|||_\infty$ is obtained, which is a generalization of an inequality of Bennett (1962) an Hoeffding (1963).

In section 5, using methods of Burkholder (1973) and results of sections 3, 4, we obtain optimal (to the above defined relation $\asymp$) upper bounds of the Rosenthal (1970)-Burkholder (1973) type on moments of the martingales in the 2-smooth Banach spaces, i.e., optimal in terms of $|||d^*|||_p$, $|||s_2|||_p$, for $p \geq 2$.

In section 6, via a modification of the martingale decomposition method by Yurinskii (1974), we apply the inequalities of section 5 to obtain bounds of the Rosenthal-Burkholder type on $||| \, \|f_n\| - E\|f_n\| \, |||_p$, $p \geq 2$, for arbitrary separable Banach space, but only for $f \in M_{ind}(X)$.

In section 7, we show that the inequalities derived in sections 5, 6 are optimal in the terms used. The key roles in the proof of the optimality are played by the results and methods of Pinelis and Utev (1984); the sums of independent real-valued random variables with a common symmetric distribution concentrated at three points turn out to represent the case when the moments are in certain sense largest.

In section 8, we obtain bounds on $|||f_n|||_p$, $p \geq 2$, $f \in M(X)$, which are optimal in terms of n and S_p. We refer to them as to bounds of the Chung-Whittle type.

Let us call a Banach space $(X, \|\cdot\|)$ 2-smooth if

$$D^2 := D^2(X) := \frac{1}{2} \sup\{(\|x\|^2)''(v,v)\colon \ x \in X\backslash\{0\}, v \in X, \|v\| = 1\} < \infty,$$

where $(\|x\|^2)''(v,v)$, the second Gateux derivative of the function $x \mapsto \|x\|^2$ computed at the point x along the vector v, is supposed to exist for all $x \in X\backslash\{0\}$, $v \in X$. Note that always $D^2 \geq 1$, so that $D := (D^2)^{1/2}$ is correctly defined.

By way of illustration, we give

Proposition 2.1. *For any $p \geq 2$ and any measure space $(T, \mathcal{A}, \nu)$, $L^p := L^p(T, \mathcal{A}, \nu)$ is 2-smooth with $D^2(L^p) \leq p - 1$.*

Proof. For $\|x\| := (\int_T |x|^p d\nu)^{1/p}$, $x \in X\backslash\{0\}$, $v \in X$, one has

$$\frac{1}{2}(\|x\|^2)''(v,v) = (p-1)\|x\|^{2-p} \int_T |X|^{p-2} v^2 d\nu$$

$$- (p-2)\|x\|^{2-2p}\left(\int_T |x|^{p-2}xvd\nu\right)^2$$

$$\leq (p-1)\|v\|^2 - 0, \tag{2.1}$$

in view of Hölder's inequality. This implies the proposition.

Immediately, we have

Corollary 2.2. *If X is a Hilbert space, then, $D(X) = 1$.*

Remark 2.3. If $L^p = L^p(T, \mathcal{A}, \nu)$ is at least two-dimensional, i.e., if there exists $T_0 \in \mathcal{A}$ such that $0 < \nu(T_0) < \nu(T)$, then $D^2(L^p) = p - 1$, so that $0 < \nu(T_0) < \nu(T)$, then $D^2(L^p) = p - 1$, so that Proposition 2.1 gives the best bound. Indeed, put $x \equiv \nu(T\backslash T_0)^{1/p}$ on T_0, $x \equiv \nu(T_0)^{1/p}$ on $T\backslash T_0$, $v \equiv x$ on T_0, $v \equiv -x$ on $T\backslash T_0$. Then $x \neq 0$, and (2.1) turns into an equality.

Proposition 2.4. *If $f \in M(X)$ and X is a 2-smooth, separable Banach space, then*

$$|||f_n|||_2 \leq D|||s|||_2 = D|||S|||_2.$$

Proof. For $j = 1, 2, \ldots$, put

$$g(t) = E\|f_{j-1} + td_j\|^2.$$

Then $g'(0) = 0, g''(*t) \leq 2D^2|||d_j|||_2^2$, and so,

$$E\|f_j\|^2 - E\|f_{j-1}\|^2 = g(1) - g(0) = \int_0^1 g''(t)(1-t)dt$$

$$\leq D^2|||d_j|||^2, \quad j = 1, 2, \ldots .$$

It remains to sum up these inequalities.

The upper bounds provided by Theorems 15.1 and 21.1 of Burkholder (1973) can be immediately extended to the martingales in the 2-smooth separable Banach spaces. Let us state this as

Theorem 2.5. *If $f \in M(X)$, X is a 2-smooth separable Banach space, a function ϕ: $[0, \infty) \to [0, \infty)$ is non-decreasing $\phi(0) = 0$, and $\phi(2u) \leq c_\phi\phi(u)$, $u \geq 0$, for some c_ϕ, then*

$$E\phi(f^*) \leq c_{2.2}[E\phi(D_s) + E\phi(d^*)]; \tag{2.2}$$

if, moreover, ϕ is convex, then

$$E\phi(f^*) \leq c_{2.3}E\phi(DS)^u; \tag{2.3}$$

here, $c_{2.2}$ and $c_{2.3}$ depend only on c_ϕ.

Proof repeats that in Burkholder (1973) with the following exceptions: use $\|\cdot\|$, $|||\cdot|||_2$ instead of $|\cdot|$, $\|\cdot\|_2$, resp., and 2) use Proposition 2.4 instead of the identities (in the notation therein): $\|h\|_2 = \|S(h)\|_2$ and $\|h\|_2 = \|s(h)\|_2$.

It is well known (see, e.g., (11.1) in Burkholder (1991)) that $(A_p)^p$ is optimum for $c_{2.3}$ at least if X is a Hilbert space. As to optimum bounds like (2.3) for conditionally symmetric martingales, see section 5.

3. Exponential bounds on tail probabilities for martingales in the 2-smooth spaces.

Theorem 3.1. *Suppose that $f \in M(X)$, X is a separable 2-smooth Banach space and $\lambda > 0$ is such that $Ee^{\lambda\|d_j\|} < \infty$ for $j = 1, 2, \dots$. Then for all $r \geq 0$,*

$$P(f^* \geq r) \leq 2e^{-\lambda r} \left\| \prod_{j=1}^{\infty} [1 + D^2 E_{j-1}(e^{\lambda\|d_j\|} - 1 - \lambda\|d_j\|)] \right\|_\infty \tag{3.1}$$

$$< 2\exp\{-\lambda r + D^2 \left\| \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} E_{j-1}(e^{\lambda\|d_j\|} - 1 - \lambda\|d_j\|) \right\|_\infty . \tag{3.2}$$

Proof. As in Pinelis (1992), note that for any nonnegative convex twice differentiable function u,

$$\begin{aligned} (\cosh u)'' &= u'^2 \cosh u + u'' \sinh u \\ &\leq (u'^2 + u''u)\cosh u = \frac{1}{x2}(u^2)'' \cosh u \end{aligned} \tag{3.3}$$

because $u'' \geq 0$, $\sinh u \leq u \cosh u$, $u \geq 0$. Consider

$$\varphi(t) := E_{j-1} \cosh \lambda\|f_{j-1} + td_j\|, \quad |t| \leq 1.$$

In view of (3.3) and the definition of the 2-smooth spaces in Section 2,

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi''(t) &\leq D^2\lambda^2 E_{j-1}\|d_j\|^2 \cosh \lambda\|f_{j-1} + td_j\| \\ &\leq D^2\lambda^2 E_{j-1}\|d_j\|^2 e^{\lambda t\|d_j\|} \cosh \lambda f_{j-1}\|, \end{aligned}$$

$|t| < 1$. But $\varphi'(0) = 0$, and therefore,

$$E_{j-1} \cosh \lambda\|f_j\| = \varphi(1) = \varphi(0) + \int_0^1 (1-t)\varphi''(t)dt \leq (1 + e_j)\cosh \lambda\|f_{j-1}\|,$$

where we set

$$e_j = D^2 E_{j-1}(e^{\lambda\|d_j\|} - 1 - \lambda\|d_j\|), \quad j = 1, 2, \dots .$$

Thus, putting $G_0 = 1$,

$$G_j = (\cosh \lambda\|f_j\|) \prod_{i=1}^{j} [1 + e_i]^{-1},$$

$j = 1, 2, \dots$, we get a positive supermartingale. Hence, if

$$\tau := \inf\{j\colon\ \|f_j\| \geq r\},$$

then $EG_\tau \leq EG_0 = 1$, and so,

$$P(f^* \geq r) \leq P\left(G_\tau \geq (\cosh \lambda r) / \left\| \prod_{j=1}^{\infty} (1 + e_j) \right\|_\infty \right)$$

since $\cosh u > e^u/2$. Thereby, (3.1) is proved; (3.2) is elementary.

Remark 3.2. For $f \in M_{ind}(\Re)$ i.e., for sums of independent zero-mean real-valued random variables, the following is used as a starting point when proving exponential inequalities:

$$P(f_n \geq r) \leq e^{-\lambda r} \prod_{j=1}^{n} [1 + E(e^{\lambda d_j} - 1 - \lambda d_j)]$$
$$\leq \exp\left\{ -\lambda r + \sum_{j=1}^{n} E(e^{\lambda d_j} - 1 - \lambda d_j) \right\}.$$

Thus, Theorem 3.1 provides a similar starting point for $f \in M(X)$, X being 2-smooth. (In this sense, it is analogous to the results of Pinelis and Sakhanenko (1985) for sums of independent random vectors.) A general method of obtaining exact exponential inequalities for sums of independent real-valued random variables is proposed in Pinelis and Utev (1989). So, for the martingales in the 2-smooth spaces, these two devices taken together produce analogues of exact "independent real-valued" exponential bounds. For instance, this remark easily leads to the following analogues of classical results of Bernstein (1924) and Bennett (1962)-Hoeffding

(1963) (cf. Theorem 9 and 3, resp., in Pinelis and Utev (1989)).

Theorem 3.3. *Suppose that $f \in M(X)$, X is a 2-smooth separable Banach space, and*

$$\left\| \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} E_{j-1} \|d_j\|^m \right\|_{\infty} \leq m! \Gamma^{m-2} B^2 / (2D^2)$$

for some $\Gamma > 0$, $B > 0$ and $m = 2, 3, \ldots$. Then for all $r \geq 0$,

$$P(f^* \geq r) < 2 \exp\left(- \frac{r^2}{B^2 + B\sqrt{B^2 + 2\Gamma r}} \right).$$

Proof. Under the conditions given,

$$D^2 \left\| \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} E_{j-1}(e^{\lambda \|d_j\|} - 1 - \lambda \|d_j\|) \right\|_{\infty} \leq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \lambda^m \Gamma^{m-2} B^2 \frac{B^2 \lambda^2}{2(1 - \lambda\Gamma)}, 0 \leq \lambda < \frac{1}{\lambda}.$$

Now (3.2) yields

$$P(f^* \geq r) < 2 \exp\left\{ -\lambda r + \frac{B^2 \lambda^2}{2(1 - \lambda\Gamma)} \right\}.$$

It remains to minimize the R.H.S. in λ.

Theorem 3.4. *Suppose that $f \in M(X)$, X is a 2-smooth separable Banach space, and $|||d^*|||_\infty \le a$, $|||s_2|||_\infty \le b/D$ for some $a > 0$, $b > 0$. Then for all $r \ge 0$,*

$$P(f^* \ge r) < 2\exp\left[\frac{r}{a} - \left(\frac{r}{a} + \frac{b^2}{a^2}\right)\ln\left(1 + \frac{ra}{b^2}\right)\right] \tag{3.4}$$

$$< 2\left(\frac{eb^2}{ra}\right)^{r/2}. \tag{3.5}$$

Proof. Since the function $g(u) := u^{-2}(e^u - 1 - u)$ for $u \ne 0$, $g(0) := 1/2$) is increasing in $u \in \Re$,

$$E_{j-1}(e^{\lambda\|d_j\|} - 1 - \lambda\|d_j\|) \le \frac{e^{\lambda a} - 1 - \lambda a}{a^2} E_{j-1}\|d_j\|^2.$$

Now (3.2) yields

$$P(f^* \ge r) < 2\exp\left\{-\lambda r + \frac{e^{\lambda a} - 1 - \lambda a}{a^2} b^2\right\},$$

and minimization in λ gives (3.4). Inequality (3.5) is trivial. The theorem is proved.

A bound similar to (3.4), but somewhat weaker, was proved by Kallenberg and Sztencel (1991) for the special case $X = L^2$; their method seems to be confined only to Hilbert spaces.

Theorem 3.4 was proved in Pinelis (1992) for $X = L^2$, $p \ge 2$; a version for the general 2-smooth spaces was given therein too, but with another, greater constant in place of D.

Theorem 3.5. *Suppose that $f \in M(X)$, X is a 2-smooth separable Banach space, and $\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} |||d_j|||_\infty^2 \le b_*^2$. Then for all $r \ge 0$,*

$$P(f^* \ge r) \le 2\exp\left\{-\frac{r^2}{2D^2 b_*^2}\right\}.$$

Proof is the same as that of Theorem 3 in Pinelis (1992) except that, in view of (3.3), one can use D^2 instead of B therein.

Theorem 3.5 can be improved in this special case of conditionally symmetric martingales.

Theorem 3.6. *Suppose that X is a 2-smooth separable Banach space, $f \in M(X)$, $|||S(f)|||_\infty \le b$, and the increments d_j's are F_{j-1}-conditionally symmetrically distributed, $j = 1, 2, \ldots$. Then for all $r \ge 0$,*

$$P(f^* > r) \le 2\exp\left\{-\frac{r^2}{2D^2 b^2}\right\}.$$

Proof. Being conditionally symmetric, (f_j) is a martingale also relative to the sequence (G_j), where G_j is the σ-field generated by F_j and $\|d_{j+1}\|$, $j = 0, 1, \ldots$; see, e.g. Lemma 10.2 in Burkholder (1991). Now, the proof can be concluded as that of Theorem 3 in Pinelis ((1992): only the conditional expectations given G_j's are taken instead of those given F_j's, and D^2, $\|d_j\|^2$ are used in place of B, b_n^2 therein.

In the case when $X = \Re$ and d_j's are simple functions, Theorem 3.6 was given in Hitczenko (190) Upper bounds for the L_p-norms of martingales, Probab. Th. Rel. Fields **86**, 225-238.

An analogous result for sums of independent random vectors in arbitrary separable Banach spaces is given in Pinelis (1990).

5. A spectrum of bounds of Rosenthal-Burkholder type on moments of martingales in 2-smooth spaces.

Theorem 5.1. *If $f \in M(X)$, X is a 2-smooth separable Banach space, $p \geq 2$, $1 \leq c \leq p$, then*

$$|||f^*|||_p < c|||d^*|||_p + \sqrt{c}\, e^{p/c} D|||s_2|||_p; \tag{5.1}$$

in particular,

$$|||f^*|||_p < p|||d^*|||_p + \sqrt{p}\, D|||s_2|||_p, \tag{5.2}$$

$$|||f^*|||_p < \frac{p}{\ln p}(|||d^*|||_p + D|||s_2|||_p) \tag{5.3}$$

$$|||f^*|||_p < \alpha|||d^*|||_p + e^{p/\alpha} D|||s_2|||_p, \quad 1 \leq \alpha \leq \frac{p}{\ln(ep)}. \tag{5.4}$$

Proof. We need

Lemma 5.2. *Suppose that $f \in M(X)$, the increment's d_j's are F_{j-1}-conditionally symmetrically distributed, $j = 1, 2, \ldots$, $\lambda > 0$, $\delta_1 > 0$, $\delta_2 > 0$, $\beta - 1 - 1 - \delta_2 > 0$. Then*

$$P(f^* > *\beta\lambda, w^* \leq \lambda) \leq \varepsilon P(f^* > \lambda),$$

where $w^* = \left(\frac{d^*}{\delta_2}\right) \vee \left(\frac{s}{\delta_1}\right)$

$$\varepsilon = 2\left(\frac{e}{N}, \frac{\delta_1^2}{\delta_2^2}\right)^N, \quad N = \frac{\beta - 1 - \delta_2}{\delta_2}. \tag{5.5}$$

Proof. Put $\bar{d}_j = d_j I\{\|d_j\| \leq \delta_2\lambda\}$, $\bar{f}_j = \sum_{i=0}^{j} \bar{d}_i$,

$$\mu = \inf\{j\colon\ \|\bar{f}_j\| > \lambda\},$$
$$\nu = \inf\{j\colon\ \|\bar{f}_j\| > \beta\lambda\},$$
$$\tau = \inf\{j\colon\ \bar{s}_{j+1} > \lambda\},$$

where $\bar{s}_{j+1} = \sum_{i=1}^{j+1} E_{i-1}\|\bar{d}_i\|^2$,

$$h_j = \bar{f}_{(j\wedge\tau\wedge\nu)\vee\mu} - \bar{f}_\mu, \qquad j = 0, 1, \dots \ .$$

Then $E_{j-1}\bar{d}_j = 0$, $h_j - h_{j-1} = \bar{d}_j I\{\mu < j \le \tau \wedge \nu\}$, $j = 1, 2, \dots$, and so, (h_j) is a martingale in X conditionally on F_μ (the σ-field consisting of all $\Omega_0 \in F$ such that $\Omega_0 \cap \{\mu = j\} \in F_j$ for all j). Besides,

$$\begin{aligned} P(f^* > \beta\lambda, w^* \le \lambda) &= P(\bar{f}^* > \beta\lambda, w^* \le \lambda) \le P(h^* > (\beta - 1 - \delta_2)\lambda) \\ &= EP(h^* > (\beta - 1 - \delta_2)\lambda \mid F_\mu) I\{\mu < \infty\} \\ &\le \varepsilon P(\mu < \infty) = \varepsilon P(f^* > \lambda); \end{aligned}$$

here, we have applied (3.5) with $r = (\beta - 1 - \delta_2)\lambda$, $a = \delta_2\lambda$, $b = \delta_1\lambda$. The lemma is proved.

Let us now turn to the proof of the theorem itself. Argument in Hitczenko (1990) shows that we need to prove the theorem only in the two cases:

1) the increments d_j's are F_{j-1}-conditionally symmetrically distributed, and 2) $f \in M_{ind}(X)$. But via the standard symmetrization formula $\widetilde{X} = X - X'$, where X, X' are independent copies, one can easily reduce case 2) to 1). Thus, one can use Lemma 5.2.

Applying now Lemma 7.1 in Burkholder (1973) with $\phi(\lambda) = \lambda^p$, $\gamma = \beta^p$, $\delta = \eta = 1$, one has

$$\|f^*\|_p \le 2\beta \left(\frac{2|||d^*|||_p}{\delta_2} + \frac{D|||s_2|||_p}{\delta_1} \right) \quad \text{if} \quad \beta^2\varepsilon \le 1/2, \tag{5.6}$$

where ε is given by (5.5). Choose now, for any $c \in [1, p]$,

$$\beta = 1 + e^{-p/c} + \frac{1}{c}, \quad \delta_2 = \frac{1}{10c}, \quad \delta_1 = \frac{1}{10\sqrt{c}\, e^{p/c}}.$$

Then $\beta < 3$,

$$\begin{aligned} N\left(= \frac{\beta - 1 - \delta_2}{\delta_2}\right) &= 9 + 10ce^{-p/c} > 9, \\ \beta^p &= [1 + (N+1)\delta_2]^p < e^{2pN\delta_2}, \\ (\beta^p\varepsilon)^{1/N} &< 2^{1/9} e^{2p\delta_2} \frac{e}{10ce^{-p/c}} \frac{c}{e^{2p/c}} < \frac{1}{2}, \end{aligned}$$

so (5.6) implies

$$|||f^*|||_p \le 6(20c|||d^*|||_p + 10\sqrt{c}\, e^{p/c} D|||s_2|||_p);$$

thus, (5.1) is proved.

Let c_p stand for the unique solution to the equation $\sqrt{c_p} = e^{p/c_p}$. The $c_p \sim 2p/\ln p$ as $p \to \infty$. Hence, putting $c = p$, $c = c_p$, in (5.1), one comes to (5.2), (5.3), resp.

The function $g(c) := \sqrt{c}\, e^{p/c}$ decreases on $[1, p]$, $g(1) = e^p$, $g(p) = e\sqrt{p} < ep$. Hence, for each $\alpha \in [1, p/\ln(ep)]$, there exists $z_\alpha \in [1, p]$, the unique solution to the equation $g(z_\alpha) = e^{p/\alpha}$; besides $g(2\alpha) = e^{p/\alpha}\sqrt{2\alpha}\, e^{-p/(2\alpha)} \le e^{p/\alpha}\sqrt{2\alpha_p} e^{-p/(2\alpha p)} < g(z_\alpha)$, where $\alpha_p := p/\ln(ep)$. Thus, $z_\alpha < 2\alpha$. Now we see that (5.1) with $c = z_\alpha$ yields (5.4).

The theorem is completely proved.

For $X = \Re$, inequalities (5.3) and (5.2) were proved in Hitczenko (1990) and Hitczenko (1991), resp.

A spectrum of bounds on moments of martingales in Hilbert spaces with bounded second conditional moments was found in Pinelis (1980). It is

essentially equivalent to (5.1) at least in the case of independent increments d_j's (see Proposition 10.3 below) but has a much more cumbersome expression.

The infimum in c of the R.H.S. of (5.1), evaluated in Sect. 7, is an upper bound on $|||f^*|||_p$ optimal in terms of $|||d^*|||_p$, $|||s|||_p$, the optimum choice of c depending, obviously, on $|||d^*|||_p/|||s|||_p$. Besides, for each $c \in [1, p]$, the "individual" bound $c|||d^*|||_p + \sqrt{c}\, e^{p/c}|||s|||_p$ is optimal for a certain corresponding value of $|||d^*|||_p/|||s|||_p$, in particular, all the bounds in (5.2)-(5.4) are optimal. The issue of optimality is treated rigorously in Sect. 7.

Theorem 5.3. *If X is a 2-smooth separable Banach space, $f \in M(X)$, and the increments d_j's are F_{j-1}-conditionally symmetrically distributed, then*

$$|||f^*|||_p < \sqrt{p}\, D|||S|||_p, \qquad p \ge 1.$$

Proof. Consider f as a martingale relative to the sequence of σ-fields (G_j) defined in the proof of Theorem 3.6. Then $s = S$. Reasoning as in the proof of Lemma 5.2 but using Theorem 3.6 instead of Theorem 3.4, we see that

$$P(f^* > \beta\lambda, DS \le \delta\lambda) \le \varepsilon P(f^* > \lambda),$$

$\lambda > 0, \delta > 0, \beta - 1 - \delta > 0$, where $\varepsilon = \exp[-\delta^{-2}(\beta - 1 - \delta)^2/2]$. It remains to choose, say, $\beta = 2$, $\delta = (0.1)p^{-1/2}$ and apply Lemma 7.1 of Burkholder (1973).

For conditionally symmetric martingales in Hilbert spaces (see Burkholder (1991), chapter 11),

$$|||f_n|||_p \le A_p|||S|||_p \tag{5.7}$$

for $3 \le p < \infty$, where A_p equals μ_p, the largest positive zero of the parabolic cylinder function D_p of order p; Davis (1976) proved a version of (5.7) for real continuous martingales with $A_p = \mu_p$ if $2 \le p < \infty$ and $A_p = \nu_p$ if $0 < p \le 2$, and also for real conditionally symmetric martingales, with $A_p = \nu_p$, $0 < p \le 2$, where ν_p is the smallest positive zero of D_p. For any real martingale with independent symmetrically distributed increments, it follows from the result of Whittle (1960) that (5.7) takes place with $A_p = |||\xi|||_p$, $p \ge 3$, where $\xi \sim N(0, 1)$ (the last result was stated for $p \ge 2$, but actually proved only for $p = 2$ or $p \ge 3$). In all these cases, the indicated values of A_p are exact. Since $|||\xi|||_p \asymp p^{1/2}$, the bound in Theorem 5.3 is optimal (to $\asymp$), say, for $p \ge 1$.

6. Applications: bounds on central moments of the norm of the sum of independent random vectors in arbitrary Banach spaces.

Theorem 6.1. *If $f \in M_{ind}(X)$, X is any separable Banach space, $p \geq 2$, $1 \leq c \leq p$, and x is non-random vector in X, then*

$$|||\,\|f_n + x\| - E\|f_n + x\|\,|||_p < c|||d^*|||_p + \sqrt{c}\,e^{p/c}S_2; \tag{6.1}$$

in particular,

$$|||\,\|f_n + x\| - E\|f_n + x\|\,|||_p < p|||d^*|||_p + \sqrt{p}\,S_2, \tag{6.2}$$

$$|||\,\|f_n + x\| - E\|f_n + x\|\,|||_p < \frac{p}{\ln p}(|||d^*|||_p + S_n), \tag{6.3}$$

$$|||\,\|f_n + x\| - E\|f_n + x\|\,|||_p < |||d^*|||d_p + e^{p/\alpha}S_2, \tag{6.4}$$

$1 \leq \alpha \leq p/\ln(ep)$.

Proof. We use the following modification of the method of Yurinskii (1974), being stated here as

Lemma 6.2. *For $f \in M_{ind}(X)$, put $\zeta_j = E_j\|f_n + x\| - E\|f_n + x\|$, $\xi_{j+1} = \zeta_{j+1} - \zeta_j$, $j = 0, 1, \ldots, n$. Then (ζ_j) is a martingale*

$$|\xi_j| \leq \|d_j\| + E\|d_j\|, \quad E_{j-1}\xi_j^2 \leq \|d_j\|^2$$

a.s., $j = 1, \ldots, n$, and

$$\|f_n + x\| - E\|f_n + x\| = \zeta_n.$$

Proof can be found in each of the papers of Pinelis (1981, 1986), Pinelis and Sakhanenko (1985). Since it is very short, we repeat it here for the reader's convenience. Put $\eta_j = E_j(\|f_n + x\| - \|f_n + x - d_j\|)$. Then $|\eta_j| \leq \|d_j\|$ a.s. Besides, $\xi_j = \eta_j - E_{j-1}\eta_j$ a.s., $j = 1, \ldots, n$, in view of the independence of d_j's; hence,

$$|\xi_j| \leq |\eta_j| + |E_{j-1}\eta_j| \leq \|d_j\| + E\|d_j\|$$
$$E_{J-1}\xi_j^2 = E_{j-1}\eta_j^2 - (E_{j-1}\eta_j)^2 \leq E_{j-1}\eta_j^2 \leq E\|d_j\|^2$$

a.s., $j = 1, \ldots, n$. The lemma is proved.

To complete now the proof of Theorem 6.1, apply Theorem 5.1 to the martingale $(0, \zeta_1, \zeta_2, \ldots, \zeta_n, \zeta_n, \zeta_n, \ldots)$, ζ_j's defined in Lemma 6.2. Using the lemma and the inequalities of Minkowsky and Hölder, we see that

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{j-1}^{n} E_{j=1}\xi_j^2 &\leq \sum_{j=1}^{n} E\|d_j\|^2 = S_2^2, \\
|||\max_{j\leq n}|\xi_j|\,|||_p &\leq |||\max_j(\|d_j\| + E\|d_j\|)|||_p \\
&\leq |||d^*|||_p + \max_j E\|d_j\| \\
&\leq 2|||d^*|||_p.
\end{aligned}$$

Finally, note that $D(R) = 1$. Now the statement of Theorem 6.1 is evident.

Hoffman-Jørgensen (1974) found the following extension of the Rosenthal's inequality for $f \in M_{ind}(X)$, $p \geq 1$:

$$|||f_n|||_p < c(p)(|||d^*|||_p + |||f_n|||_1). \tag{6.5}$$

There is an opinion that his approach only provides for an exponential $c(p)$. We show (see Proposition 10.2 below) that the best choice of parameters in the method of Hoffman-Jørgensen gives (6.5) with $c(p) = p$.

For $f \in M_{ind}(X)$, Pinelis (1978) proved that

$$|||f_n|||_p < c_1(p)|||f_n|||_1 + c_2(p)S_p + c_3(p)S_2,$$

which is also a generalization of the Rosenthal's (1970) inequality; the method can actually yield $c_1(p) = 1$, $c_2(p) = p$, $c_3(p) = \sqrt{p}$.

An inequality, implying (6.1), was obtained in Pinelis (1980) (see Proposition 10.3 below).

De Acosta (1981) proved a version of (6.3) but with $x = 0$ and with an

implicit factor $c(p)$ instead of $p/\ln p$. Since he used the inequality of Burkholder (1973), Proposition 10.1 below shows that in fact that his method leads to $c(p) = p$.

Using isoperimetric technique Talagrand (1989) proved the following version of (6.5):

$$|||f_n|||_p < \frac{p}{\ln(cp)}(|||d^*|||_p + |||f_n|||_1) \tag{6.6}$$

for $f \in M_{ind}(X)$, $p \geq 1$, which was also proved in Kwapień and Szulga (1991) by a different method. The Talagrand's inequality may be compared with (6.1) and, in particular, with (6.3). If S_2 is much greater than $|||d^*|||_p + |||f_n|||_1$, then (6.1) may lose to (6.6) in certain cases. If however X is e.g. of cotype 2, then (6.3) is no worse then (6.6); moreover, say, in the typical case of the increments with the same or almost the same distribution, (6.2) is significantly better. On the other hand, if there are heavy distribution tails, i.e., if $|||d^*|||_p$ is much greater than both S_2 and $|||f_n|||_1$, then (6.4) with $\alpha \asymp 1$ does better than (6.6). Other advantages of bounds (6.1)-(6.4) are that they are applicable to the sums of non-zero-mean random vectors (owing to the presence of x) and better reflect the concentration phenomenon of the distribution of the sum of independent random vectors.

Methods for $f \in M_{ind}(X)$, allowing reduction of the problem of upper bounds on the L.H.S. of (6.1) for any separable Banach space X to that of upper bounds on $|||f_n|||_p$ for $f \in M_{ind}(\Re)$ were proposed in Berger (1991) for $x = 0$ and in Pinelis (1992) for any x (actually, instead of the power moment function $u \mapsto |u|^p$, one can use there any convex function).

A straightforward application of Theorem 5.1 yields the following bounds in the case of sums of independent zero-mean random variables.

Theorem 6.3. *Suppose that $f \in M_{ind}(X)$, X is a Hilbert space, $p \geq 2$, $1 \leq c \leq p$. Then*

$$|||f_n|||_p < cS_p + \sqrt{c}\, e^{p/c} S_2; \tag{6.7}$$

in particular,

$$|||f_n|||_p < pS_p + \sqrt{p}\, S_2, \tag{6.8}$$

$$|||f_n|||_p < \frac{p}{\ln p}(S_p + S_2), \tag{6.9}$$

$$|||f_n|||_p < \alpha S_p + e^{p/\alpha} S_2, \qquad 1 \leq \alpha \leq \frac{p}{\ln(ep)}. \tag{6.10}$$

Proof, in view of Theorem 5.1 and Proposition 2.1, consists in the following trivial remarks: $|||f_n|||_p \leq |||f^*|||p$,

$$|||d^*|||_p \leq S_p, \tag{6.11}$$

and, for $f \in M_{ind}(X)$, $s_2 = S_2$ a.s.

As it was said in section 5, the results of Pinelis (1980) imply (6.1), (6.7) it was also explained in that paper how the elicit bounds like (6.8) and (6.10) (for $\alpha = 4$). Nevertheless, it is not obvious how to deduce a general inequality like (6.7) from the spectrum of bounds in Pinelis (1980) (again, we refer to Proposition 10.3). From this point of view, even in the classical case of sums of independent real-valued zero-mean random variables, (6.7) is apparently new.

An inequality similar to, say, (6.9), but with 2^p instead of $p/\ln p$, was probably first found by Rosenthal (1970) for $f \in M_{ind}(\Re)$, who also obtained a lower bound, which differs from the upper one by a factor depending only on p.

Rosén (1970) proved a result for $f \in M_{ind}(\Re)$, which implies the upper Rosenthal's bound for $p = 2, 4, 6, \ldots$ (this implication was unnoticed; to demonstrate it, one can put, in the notation of Rosén,

$$\lambda_\nu(p) = (EX_\nu^{2p}/EX_\nu^2)^{1/(2p-2)}), \quad \rho_\nu(p) + EX_\nu^2/\lambda_\nu(p)^2).$$

Moreover, using some ideas from Dharmadhikari and Jogdeo (1969), it is possible to deduce the upper bound by Rosenthal for all $p \geq 2$ from the Rosén's result.

A method like just described was used in the student diploma work of Pinelis (1974) to prove an upper bound of the Rosenthal type for $f \in M_{ind}(\Re)$ (via the Marcienkiewicz-Zygmund (1937) inequality, the lower Rosenthal bound was also obtained therein. While the constants in Pinelis (1974) were implicit, the method could yield (6.9); regrettably, the results of Rosenthal (1970) and Burkholder (1973) and long remained unknown to the author, and so the problem of the constants was not among the ones considered then by him as most urgent.

Inequality (6.9) for $f \in M_{ind}(\Re)$ and for sums of exchangeable random variables, with the proof that $p/\ln p$ is optimal in (6.9), was first given by Johnson, Schechtman and Zinn (1985).

A.I. Sakhanenko, a referee of the mentioned diploma work, upon having reviewed it, suggested another approach, giving in effect (6.8), again for $f \in M_{ind}\Re$) (see Nagaev and Pinelis (1977)).

An inequality, similar to (6.10) with $\alpha = 4$, was found by Sazonov (1974).

All bounds in Theorem 5.1, 6.1, 6.3 are optimum. We will prove the optimality in the next section, using results and ideas from Pinelis and Utev (1984), where, in particular, for any $p \geq 2$,

$$\sup\{|||f_n|||_p\colon\ f \in M_{ind}(\Re), \quad S_2 \quad \text{and} \quad S_p \quad \text{fixed}\}$$

was computed up to an absolute-constant factor, which, for instance, implies all inequalities (6.7)-(6.10) for $f \in M_{ind}(\Re)$; also, it was noted in Pinelis and Utev (1984) that bounds like (6.8) and (6.10) for $\alpha \asymp 1$ represent in a certain sense the two extreme bounds in the spectrum of all optimal bounds on moments, the optimum value of a "spectrum parameter" depending on S_p/S_2.

7. Optimality of the bounds on moments.

Let us consider the following upper bounds for any $\alpha_2 > 0$, $\alpha_p > 0$, $p \geq 2$:

$$\begin{aligned}
B_p &:= B_p(a_p, a_2) \\
&:= \sup\{|||f^*|||_p\colon\ f \in M(X), X \text{ is 2-smooth}, \\
&\qquad |||d^*|||_p = a_p, \quad D|||s_2|||_p = a_2\}, \\
B^X_{p,ind} &:= B^X_{p,ind}(a_p, a_2) \\
&:= \sup\{|||\,\|f_n + x\| - E\|f_n + x\|\,|||_p\colon\ f \in M_{ind}(X), \\
&\qquad |||d^*|||_p = a_p, S_2 = a_2\}, \\
B_{p,ind,0} &:= B_{p,ind,0}(a_p, a_2) \\
&:= \sup\{|||f_n|||_p\colon\ f \in M_{ind}(\Re), \\
&\qquad |||d^*|||_p = a_p, S_2 = a_2\},
\end{aligned}$$

and their analogues $B_{p,S} = B_{p,S}(a_p, a_2)$,

$$B^X_{p,ind,S} = B^X_{p,ind,S}(a_p, a_2), \quad B_{p,ind,0,S} = B_{p,ind,0,S}(a_p, a_2),$$

obtained by replacing the equality $|||d^*|||_p = a_p$ in the above definitions by $S_p = a_p$.

We shall show that all the introduced bounds are equivalent to each of the following:

$$B^*_p := B^*_p(a_p, a_2) = a_p + \sqrt{p}\, a_2 + \frac{p a_p}{\ln(2 + \frac{a_p}{a_2}\sqrt{p})},$$

$$\widehat{B}_p := \widehat{B}_p(a_p, a_2) := \min\{c a_p + \sqrt{c}\, e^{p/c} a_2\colon\ 1 \leq c \leq p\},$$

and

$$\check{B}_p := \check{B}_p(a_p, a_2) := \max\{(p\alpha + 1)^{1-\alpha/2} a_p^{1-\alpha} a_2^{\alpha}\colon\ 0 \leq \alpha \leq 1\}.$$

The following statement principally means that for any pair (a_p, a_2) of the values of the characteristics used in the bounds (5.1), (6.1) and (6.7) there exists a value of "spectrum parameter" c providing an optimum bound. Roughly speaking, it means that spectra (5.1), (6.1) and (6.7) are rich enough, so it may be called the "spectrum completeness theorem". It also means that it is not essential in this context which of th two pairs of values is fixed: of $|||d^*|||_p$ and $|||s_2|||_p$, or of S_p and $|||s_2|||_p$.

Theorem 7.1. *For all $p > 2$, $a_2 > 0$, $a_p > 0$ and for all separable Banach spaces $(X, \|\cdot\|)$,*

$$B_p \asymp B^X_{p,ind} \asymp B_{p,ind,0} \asymp B_{p,S} \asymp B^X_{p,ind,S} \asymp B_{p,ind,0,S} \\ \asymp \check{B}_p \asymp \widehat{B}_p \asymp B^*_p.$$

Proof is comparatively long and will be given later in this section.

The "spectrum" $ca_p + \sqrt{c}\, e^{p/c} a_2$, $1 \le c \le p$, turns out to be not only "complete" but also "minimal" in the sense that for each $c \in [1, p]$, there exist $a_p > 0$, $a_2 > 0$ such that the "individual" bound $ca_p + \sqrt{c}\, e^{p/c} a_2$ is the best possible. Let us now give the rigorous statement.

Theorem 7.2. *For any $c \in [1, p]$, $p > 2$,*

$$\max\left\{ \frac{B_p(a_p, a_2)}{ca_p + \sqrt{c}\, e^{p/c} a - 2} \colon\ a_p > 0, a_2 > 0 \right\} \asymp 1;$$

here an of the other 5 bounds $B^X_{p,ind}, B_{p,ind,0}$, $B_{p,S}$, $B^X_{p,ind,S}$, $B_{p,ind,0}$ may be used in place of B_p. In particular, all bounds (5.2)-(5.9), (6.2)-(6.4), (6.8)-(6.10) are optimal.

Proof will be given after that of Theorem 7.1.

The following proposition might seem analogous to Theorem 7.2, but it is less important since, for an "individual" value of α, $(p\alpha + 1)^{1-\alpha/2} a_p^{1-\alpha} a_2^{\alpha}$ does not represent an upper bound on the moments – actually, by Theorem 7.1, $B_p(a_p, a_2) > (p\alpha + 1)^{1-\alpha/2} a_p^{1-\alpha} a_2^{\alpha}$.

Proposition 7.3. *For any $\alpha \in [0, 1], p > 2$,*

$$\min\left\{ \frac{B_p(a_p, a_2)}{(p\alpha + 1)^{1-\alpha/2} a_p^{1-\alpha} a_2^{\alpha}} \colon\ a_p > 0, a_2 > 0 \right\} \asymp 1;$$

here, any of the other 5 bounds $B^X_{p,ind}$, $B_{p,ind,0}$ $B_{p,S}$, $B^X_{p,ind,S}$, $B_{p,ind,0}$ may be used in place of B_p.

Proof will be given after that of Theorem 7.2.

Remark. It is easy to see the Doob's inequality

$$|||f^*|||_p \le |||f_n|||_p \, p/(p-1), \quad p > 1, f \in M(X),$$

(see also (1.4) in Burkholder (1973)) remains true for all separable Banach spaces X. Therefore, one could replace $|||f^*|||_p$ in the definition of B_p by $|||f_n|||_p$, and statements 7.1-7.3 would hold. This remark can be also deduced from the proof of these statements.

Proof of Theorem 7.1 is based on the following lemmas.

Lemma 7.4. *If $p > 2$, m is a positive integer, $m \le p/2$, $a_p > 0$, $a_2 > 0$, then*

$$B_{p,ind,0}(a_p, a_2) > a_p + B_{2m,ind,sym,S}((a_p^{2m-2} a_2^{p-2m})^{\frac{1}{p-2}}, a_2),$$

where $B_{2m,ind,sym,S}$ may be defined by (7.4) below.

Proof. Put $g_n(t) = t^{-p/2}[1-(1-t/n)^n]$, $g_\infty(t) = t^{-p/2}(1-e^{-t})$, $x = (a_p/a_2)^p$, $t > 0$, $n > 0$. Then $g_n(t)$ decreases in n to $g_\infty(t)$, $g_n(t)$ decreases in $t \in (0, n]$ from $g_n(0+) = \infty$ to $g_n(n) = n^{-p/2}$, $g_\infty(t)$ decreases in $t \in (0, \infty)$ from $g(0+) = \infty$ to $g(\infty) = 0$. Hence for any $n \in (a_2^2/a_p^2, \infty]$, there exists the unit solution $t_n \in (0, n)$ to the equation $g_n(t_n) = x$, and $t_n \downarrow t_\infty$ as $n \uparrow \infty$.

For any $p > 0, a_p > 0, a_2 > 0$, and any integer $n > a_2^2/a_p^2$, consider $f \in M_{ind}(\Re)$ such that

$$P(d_j = \pm u_n) = q_n/2, P(d_j = 0) = 1 - q_n \quad \text{for} \quad j = 1, \dots, n,$$

$$P(d_j = 0) = 1 \quad \text{for} \quad j = n+1, n+2, \dots,$$

where

$$q_n = \frac{t_n}{n}, \quad u_n = \frac{a_2}{\sqrt{tn}}.$$

Then, for the so constructed f,

$$|||d^*|||_p = a_p, S_2 = a_2, \tag{7.1}$$

$$\begin{aligned} S_{2m} &= t_n^{(1-m)/(2m)} a_2 \to t_\infty^{(1/(2m)} u_\infty, \\ Ee^{i\lambda f_n} &= [1 + q_n(\cos \lambda u_n - 1)]^n \to Ee^{i\lambda Z}, \quad \lambda \in \Re, \end{aligned} \tag{7.2}$$

as $n \to \infty$, where

$$u_\infty = \lim_{n\to\infty} u_n = \frac{a_2}{\sqrt{t_\infty}}, \tag{7.3}$$

Z is a (symmetrized Poisson) random variable with the characteristic function

$$Ee^{i\lambda Z} = \exp[(\cos \lambda u_\infty - 1)t_\infty]. \tag{7.4}$$

Hence, by the analogue of the Fatou lemma for the convergence in distribution (see, e.g., Theorem 5.3 in Billingsley (1968)),

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty} |||f_n|||_{2m} \ge |||Z|||_{2m}. \tag{7.5}$$

Consider now, for $b_{2m} > 0, b_2 > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} B_{2m,ind,sym,S}(b_{2m}, b_2) := \sup\{|||f_n|||_{2m}\colon\ & f \in M_{ind}(\Re), d_j\text{'s} \\ & \text{symmetrically distributed, } S_{2m} = b_{2m}, \quad S_2 = b_2\}. \end{aligned}$$

The theorem in Pinelis and Utev (1984) states that

$$B_{2m,ind,sym,S}(b_{2m}, b_2) = \left(\sum_{j=1}^m \Gamma_{j,m}(b_{2m}^{m-j} b_2^{j-1})^{2m/(m-1)}\right)^{\frac{1}{2m}} \tag{7.6}$$

where

$$\Gamma_{j,m} = (2m)! \sum_{r=1}^{j} \sum \prod_{k=1}^{r} ((2m_k)!)^{-j_k} / j_k!; \tag{7.7}$$

the inner summation is over all positive integers $m_1 > \cdots > m_r$ and $j_1, \ldots, j_r$ such that $m_1 j_1 + \cdots + m_r j_r = m$, $j_1 + \cdots + j_r = j$. It follows from its proof that

$$B_{2m,ind,sym,S}(t_\infty^{\frac{1}{2m}} u_\infty, t_\infty^{\frac{1}{2}} u_\infty) = |||Z|||_{2m}, \tag{7.8}$$

where Z is defined by (7.4) (note the misprint in formula (7) of Pinelis and Utev (1984): there must be $A_{2m_k,n}^{j_k}$ instead of $A_{2m_k,n}$). Observe that for the f constructed in this proof,

$$S_{2m} = (S_p^{2m-2} S_p^{p-2m})^{1/(p-2)}.$$

Now (7.2), (7.1) and the inequality $S_p \geq |||d^*|||_p$ imply

$$t_\infty^{\frac{1}{2m}} u_\infty \geq (a_p^{2m-2} a_p^{p-2m})^{1/(p-2)}. \tag{7.9}$$

But (7.6), (7.7) show that $B_{2m,ind,sym,S}$ is an increasing

function in either of its arguments. Thus using (7.5), (7.8), (7.9) and (7.3), we deduce

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty} |||f_n|||_{2m} \geq B_{2m,ind,sym,S}(a_p^{2m-2} a_2^{p-2m})^{\frac{1}{p-2}}.$$

The lower Rosenthal's bound and the Hölder's inequality give

$$|||f_n|||_p > S_p + |||f_n|||_{2m} \geq a_p + |||f_n|||_{2m}.$$

Now the statement of the lemma is obvious.

Lemma 7.5. *Under the conditions of Lemma 7.4,*

$$B_{p,ind,0,S}(a_1, a_2) > a_p + B_{2m,ind,sym,S}((a_p^{2m-2} a_2^{p-2m})^{\frac{1}{p-2}}, a_2).$$

Proof is similar to that of Lemma 7.4 but easier. In fact, Lemma 7.5 was proved in Pinelis and Utev (1984).

Lemma 7.6. *For all $p \geq 2$, $a_p > 0$, $a_2 > 0$, one has $\widehat{B}_p(a_p, a_2) < \check{B}_p(a_p, a_2)$.*

Proof. Consider the functions

$$g_p(\alpha) := (p\alpha + 1)^{1-\alpha/2} q^\alpha, q := a_2/a_p, \qquad 0 \leq \alpha \leq 1, \tag{7.10}$$

$$q_p(\alpha) := \sqrt{p\alpha + 1} \exp\left\{\frac{1}{2} \frac{p\alpha - 2}{p\alpha + 1}\right\}, \qquad 0 \leq \alpha \leq 1. \tag{7.11}$$

Then, by the definition of $\check{B}_p$,

$$\check{B}_p(a_p, a_2) = \max\{a_p g_p(\alpha):\ 0 \leq \alpha \leq 1\}. \tag{7.12}$$

Besides, q_p is continuous and increasing and maps [0,1] onto

$$I_p := \left[e^{-p}, \sqrt{p+1}\,\exp\left\{-\frac{1}{2}\frac{p}{p+1}\right\}\right]. \tag{7.13}$$

An essential relation between g_p and q_p is

$$g_p'(x) = g_p(\alpha)\ln\frac{q}{q_p(\alpha)}. \tag{7.14}$$

If we have $q \in I_p$, take $\alpha_p = q_p^{-1}(q)$; then $\alpha_p \in [0,1]$, $q = q_p(\alpha - p)$, and, in view of (7.10), (7.11),

$$\begin{aligned}(p\alpha_p+1)a_p &= a_p g_p(\alpha_p)\exp\left\{-\frac{\alpha_p}{2}\frac{p\alpha_p-2p}{p\alpha_p+1}\right\} < ea_p g_p(\alpha_p), \qquad (7.15)\\ \sqrt{p\alpha_p+1}\,e^{p/(p\alpha_p+1)}a_2 &= a_p g_p(\alpha_p)\exp\left\{\frac{p\alpha_p(3-\alpha_p)}{2(p\alpha_p+1)}\right\}\\ &< e^{3/2}a_p g_p(\alpha_p).\end{aligned}$$

This implies, with $c_p := p\alpha_p + 1$, that

$$c_p a_p + \sqrt{c_p}\,e^{p/c_p}a_2 < a_p g_p(\alpha_p) \tag{7.16}$$

(if $q \in I_p$). Obviously, $c_p \in [1, p+1]$. Hence, in view of (7.12), if $q \in I_p$ and $c_p \le p$, the lemma is true; if however $c_p \in (p, p+1]$, then

$$\begin{aligned}pa_p + \sqrt{p}\,e^{p/p}a_2 &\le c_p q_p + \sqrt{c_p}\,e^{p/c_p}ea_2\\ &< a_p g_p(\alpha_p)\end{aligned}$$

by (7.16). Thus, the lemma is true whenever $q \in I_p$.

Consider now the two cases when $q \notin I_p$.

First, suppose that

$$q < \min I_p = e^{-p}. \tag{7.17}$$

Then $q < q_p(\alpha)$ for all $\alpha \in [0,1]$, and (7.19) implies $g_p' < 0$ on $[0,1]$. Hence, $\check{B}_p(a_p, a_2) = a_p g_p(0) = a_p$; on the other hand, $\widehat{B}_p(a_p, a_p) \le a_p + e^p a_2 = (1 + e^p q)a_p \le 2a_p$ by (7.17). Thus, the lemma is true in the case (7.17), too.

Finally, let

$$q > \max I_p (> \sqrt{p}/e). \tag{7.18}$$

Then $q > q_p(\alpha)$ for all $\alpha \in [0,1]$, and (7.11) implies $\check{B}_p(a_p, a_2) = a_p a_p(1) \ge \sqrt{p}\,a_2$; but $\widehat{B}_p(a_p, a_2) \le pa_p + \sqrt{p}\,a_2 = (p/q + \sqrt{p}\,e)a_2 \le 2e\sqrt{p}\,a_2$, in consequence of (7.18). Thereby, the lemma is completely proved.

Lemma 7.7. *For all $p > 2$, $a_p > 0$, $a_2 > 0$, $B_{p,ind,0}(a_p, a_2) > \check{B}_p(a_p, a_2)$.*

Proof. By Lemma 7.4 and the estimate

$$\Gamma_{j,m}^{1/(2m)} \asymp j^{1-j/(2m)} \tag{7.19}$$

(see (9) in Pinelis and Utev (1984)),

$$B_{p,ind,0}(a_p, a_2) > a_p + \widetilde{B}_2(a_p, a_2), \tag{7.20}$$

where

$$\widetilde{B}_p(a_p, a_2) = \max\{j^{1-j/2m} a_p^{1-\alpha_j} b^{\alpha_j} \colon\ j = 1, \dots, m\},$$

$\alpha_j = 1 - \frac{2(m-j)}{p-2}$, m is the integer part of $p/2$. Since $j > p\alpha_j + 1$ and $j/(2m) \le \alpha_j/2 + 1/p$, one has $j^{1-j/2m} > (p\alpha_j + 1)^{1-\alpha_j/2}$, $j = 1, \dots, m$. Therefore,

$$\widetilde{B}_p(a_p, a_2) > \widetilde{\widetilde{B}}_p(a_p, a_2) := \max\{a_p g_p(\alpha_j) \colon\ j = 1, \dots, m\}, \tag{7.21}$$

where g_p is defined by (7.10).

Consider first the case $q \in I_p$, where q and I_p are given by (7.10) and (7.13), resp. We can assume that $p > 3$ because for $p \in [2, 3]$, $\check{B}_p(a_p, a_2) < a_p \vee a_2 < B_{p,ind,0}(a_p, a_2)$, in view of Rosenthal's lower bound. Then

$$0 \le \alpha_1 < \frac{2}{p-2} < \frac{1}{p} \quad 0 < \alpha_{j+1} - \alpha_j = \frac{2}{p-2} < \frac{1}{p};$$

besides, $\alpha_m = 1$. Note also that $q \in I_p$ implies $|\ln q| < p$. This, along with (7.14), (7.11), leads to $|g_p'(\alpha)| < p g_p(\alpha)$, and hence to $g_p(\alpha + \delta) \asymp g_p(\alpha)$ if $0 \le \alpha \le \alpha + \delta \le 1$ and $\delta < 1/p$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \check{B}_p(a_p, a_2) &= \max\{a_p g_p(\alpha) \colon\ 0 \le \alpha \le 1\} \\ &< \max\{a_p g_p(\alpha_j) \colon\ j = 1, \dots, m\}, \end{aligned}$$

and, in view of (7.20), (7.21), the lemma is true if $q \in I_p$.

Let us now consider the case (7.17). Then $\check{B}_p(a_p, q_2) = a_p g_p(0) = a_p$, and (7.20) implies the lemma.

Finally, suppose that (7.18) takes place. Then $\widetilde{\widetilde{B}}_p(a_p, a_2) = a_p g_p(1) = \check{B}_p(a_p, a_2)$, and now (7.20) and (7.21) imply the lemma, which is thereby is completely proved.

Lemma 7.8. *For all $p > 2, a_p > 0, a_2 > 0, B_{p,ind,0,\Sigma}(a_p, a_2) > \check{B}_p(a_p, a_2)$.*

Proof differs from that of Lemma 7.7 only in that we have to refer to Lemma 7.5 instead of Lemma 7.4.

Lemma 7.9. *For all $p \ge 2, a_p > 0, a_2 > 0$, one has $B_p^*(a_p, a_2) \asymp \check{B}_p(a_p, a_2)$.*

Proof. Consider first the case $q \in I_p$, where q and I_p are defined in (7.10) and (7.13), resp. Then (7.15) implies

$$\check{B}_p(a_p, a_2) = a_p g_p(\alpha_p) \asymp c_p a_p, \tag{7.21a}$$

where g_p is given by (7.10), $\alpha_p = q_p^{-1}(q)$, $c_p = p\alpha_p + 1$. Putting

$$z = \frac{p + 1/2}{c_p},$$

one has $1/2 < z$ we can rewrite $\alpha_p = q_p^{-1}(q)$ as

$$\sqrt{z}\, e^z = \frac{a_p \sqrt{e(p + \frac{1}{2})}}{a_2}.$$

Since $e^z/2 < \sqrt{z}\, e^z < e^{2z}$ when $z > 1/2$, we deduce $z \asymp \ln(2 + a_p\sqrt{p}/a_2)$,

$$c_p \asymp \frac{p}{\ln(2 + \frac{a_p}{a_2}\sqrt{p})}. \tag{7.21b}$$

In the cases (7.17) and (7.18), $\check{B}_p(a_p, a_2)$ equals $a_p g_p(0) = a_p$ and $a_p g_p(1) \asymp \sqrt{p}\, a_2$, resp. Now, taking into account (7.21a), (7.21b), (7.12), we see that $\check{B}_p < B_p^*$.

Now we can conclude the proof of Theorem 7.1. Observe that

$$B_p > B_{p,ind,0} > \check{B}_p > \widehat{B}_p > B_p;$$

the first inequality in this chain is trivial, then we successively apply Lemma 7.7, Lemma 7.5 and (5.1). Hence

$$B_p \asymp B_{p,ind,0} \asymp \check{B}_p \asymp \widehat{B}_p. \tag{7.22}$$

Note that for any separable Banach space X,

$$B_{p,ind,0} < B_{p,ind}^* \tag{7.23}$$

since $\Re$ may be isometrically embedded into X and, for $f \in M_{ind}(\Re)$,

$$|||\, |f_n + x| - E|f_n + x|, |||_p \to |||f_n|||_p \quad \text{if} \quad x \to \infty.$$

It follows from Theorem 6.1 that

$$B_{p,ind}^X < \widehat{B}_p. \tag{7.24}$$

Now (7.22)-(7.24) yield

$$B_p \asymp B_{p,ind}^X \asymp B_{p,ind,0} \asymp \check{B}_p \asymp \widehat{B}_p.$$

Analogously,

$$B_{p,S} \asymp B_{p,ind,S}^X \asymp B_{p,ind,0,S} \asymp \check{B}_p \asymp \widehat{B}_p;$$

here, we need to refer to Lemma 7.8 instead of Lemma 7.7 and also to $|||d^*|||_p \le S_p$. It remains to recall Lemma 7.9. Theorem 7.1 is proved.

Proof of Theorem 7.2. For any given $c \in [1, p]$, choose $a_p > 0$, $a_2 > 0$ so that

$$\frac{a_2}{a_p} = \sqrt{c}\, e^{-p/c}.$$

Then $ca_p = \sqrt{c}, e^{p/c} a_2$. Put $\alpha = (c-1)/p$ so that $c = p\alpha + 1$, $0 \le \alpha \le 1$, and

$$\begin{aligned} \check{B}_p(a_p, a_2) &\ge a_p g_p(\alpha) = a_p c e^{-p\alpha/c} > e^{-1} c a_p \\ &= (2e)^{-1}(ca_p + \sqrt{c}\, e^{p/c} a_2), \end{aligned}$$

where g_p is defined by (7.10). It remains to apply Theorem 7.1 and also to recall that inequalities (5.2)-(5.4), (6.2)-(6.4), (6.8)-(6.10) were obtained by choosing particular values of c.

Proof of Proposition 7.3. For any given $\alpha \in [0, 1]$, choose $\alpha_p > 0$, $a_2 > 0$ so that

$$\frac{a_2}{a_p} = q_p(\alpha), \tag{7.25}$$

where $q_p(\alpha)$ is defined by (7.11). Then, putting $c = p\alpha + 1$, we see that $1 \le c \le p + 1$ and, in view of (7.10), (7.25),

$$\begin{aligned} a_p g_p(\alpha) &= a_p c \exp\left\{\frac{p\alpha}{2}\frac{\alpha - 2}{p\alpha + 1}\right\} \asymp a_p c \\ &\asymp ca_p + \sqrt{c}\, e^{p/c} a_2 \end{aligned}$$

since, in consequence of (7.25), (7.11),

$$\sqrt{c}\, e^{p/c} a_2 = ca_p \exp\left\{\frac{p\alpha}{2(p\alpha + 1)}\right\} \asymp ca_p.$$

Thus, if the defined above $c \le p$, we see that

$$\widehat{B}_p < a_p g_p(\alpha) \tag{7.26}$$

If however $c \in (p, p + 1]$, then

$$ca_p + \sqrt{c}\, e^{p/c} a_2 \le 2pa_p + \sqrt{p}\, e^{p/p} a_2 < \widehat{B}_p,$$

so (7.26) holds. Now it remains to apply Theorem 7.1.

8. Chung-Whittle type of bounds on moments.

Consider

$$\begin{aligned} B_p^{CW}(a_p, n) := \sup\{|||f_n|||_p\colon\ &(0, f_1, \dots, f_n, f_n, f_n, \dots) \in M(X), \\ &n \text{ is fixed}, D \cdot S_p = a_p, X is 2\text{-smooth}\}. \end{aligned}$$

Theorem 8.1. *For all* $p > 2, a_p > 0, n = 1, 2, \ldots, B_p^{CW}(a_p, n) \asymp \sqrt{p \wedge n}\, n^{\frac{p-2}{2p}} a_p$.

Proof. Let $(0, f_1, \ldots, f_n, f_n, f_n, \ldots) \in M(X)$. Using the Hölder's inequality two times, we see that $|||s_2|||_p \le n^{(p-2)/(2p)} S_p$. If $p \le 3n^{(p-2)/p}$, then $p|||d^*|||_p \le pS_p < p^{1/2} n^{(p-2)/2p} S_p$, and hence (5.2) and $p \le 3n$ yield

$$B_p^{CW}(a_p, n) < \sqrt{p \wedge n}\, n^{\frac{p-2}{2p}} a_p. \tag{8.1}$$

If now $p > 3n^{(p-2)/p}$ then $p > 3$, $(p-2)/p > 1/3$, $p > 3n^{1/3}$, $n < p^3$, $n^{(p-2)/p} > n$, $p > n$. The inequalities of Minkowsky and Hölder give

$$|||f_n|||_p \le \sum_{j=1}^{n} |||d_j|||_p \le n^{(p-1)/p} S_p;$$

this and $p > n$ show that (8.1) holds. It remains to prove that

$$B_p^{CW}(a_p, n) > \sqrt{p \wedge n}\, n^{\frac{p-2}{2p}} a_p. \tag{8.2}$$

Let d_j's be independent, $P(d_j = \pm u) = 1/2$, $u > 0$, $j = 1, \ldots, n$. Then the multinomial formula yields

$$|||f_n|||_{2m} = \left(\sum_{j=1}^{m \wedge n} \binom{n}{j} j! \Gamma_{j,m} \right)^{\frac{1}{2m}} u \asymp \left(\sum_{j=1}^{m \wedge n} \binom{n}{j} j^{2m} \right)^{\frac{1}{2m}} u, \tag{8.3}$$

where $m = 1, 2, \ldots, \Gamma_{j,m}$ is defined by (7.7), and (7.19) is used. Let m be the integer part of $p/2$. If $m \le n$, then (8.3) shows that

$$\begin{aligned} |||f_n|||_p \ge |||f_n|||_{2m} &> \binom{n}{m}^{\frac{1}{2m}} mu \ge \left(\frac{n}{m}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} mu \\ &= \sqrt{m}\, n^{(p-2)/2p} S_p, \end{aligned}$$

which implies (8.2) in the case $m \le n$. If, finally, $m > n$, then it follows from (8.3) that

$$|||f_n|||_p \ge |||f_n|||_{2m} > \binom{n}{n}^{\frac{1}{2m}} nu = n^{(p-1)/p} S_p,$$

so (8.2) holds.

The theorem is completely proved.

Chung (1951), pp. 348-349, showed that in the case $f \in M_{ind}(\Re)$ the inequality of Marcinkiewicz and Zygmund (1937), p. 87, implies an estimate like (8.1) but with some $C_0 = C_0(p)$ depending only on p, instead of $\sqrt{p \wedge n}$. As it was pointed out in Dharmadhikari, Fabian and Jogdeo (1968), an analogous result for $f \in M(\Re)$ is implied by the generalization of the Marcienkiewicz-Zygmund inequality obtained by Burkholder (1966), Theorem 9 (see also Burkholder (1973),

Theorems 3.2, 15.1 or (10.2) below; using Proposition 10.1, one can see that Theorem 15.1 in Burkholder (1973) in fact give $C_0(p) = p$; a constant of the same order p is given in Theorem 3.2 of Burkholder (1973).

A direct proof due to Dharmadhihari, Fabian and Jogdeo (1968) yields $C_0(p) = p2^p$. For $f \in M_{ind}(\Re)$, Dharmadhikari and Jogdeo (1969) obtained $C_0(p) = p/\ln p$.

For $f \in M_{ind}(\Re)$, the result of Whittle (1960) implies the Marcinkiewicz-Zygmund inequality with the best constant and, along with the mentioned above Chung's remark (see also Rosén (1970)), leads to (8.1) but with $\sqrt{p}$ instead of $\sqrt{p \wedge n}$; so, for $n > p$, it gives the optimum.

What has been said is a reason for the referring to (8.1) as to an optimum bound on moments of the Chung-Whittle type.

Remark. Bounds of the Chung-Whittle type on central moments of the norm of the sum of independent random vectors in any separable Banach space can be easily derived from Theorem 8.1 (cf. Theorem 6.1).

9. One-sided bounds for the distributions of real-valued (super) martingales.

Let M_- stand for the set of all real-valued supermartingales $f = (f_0, f_1, \ldots, f_n, f_n \ldots)$ such that $f_0 = 0$, relative to a non-decreasing sequence of σ-fields $(F_0, F_1, \ldots)$. Put $f_+^* = \max\limits_j f_j$, $d_+^* = \max\limits_j d_j$.

Theorem 9.1. *If $f \in M_-$ and $\lambda > 0$ is such that $Ee^{\lambda d_j} < \infty$ for each j, then for all $r \geq 0$,*

$$P(f_+^* \geq r) \leq e^{-\lambda r} \left\| \prod_{j=1}^{\infty} (1 + e_j) \right\|_\infty$$
$$< \exp\left\{ -\lambda r + \left\| \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} e_j \right\|_\infty \right\},$$

where $e_j = E_{j-1}(e^{\lambda d_j} - 1 - \lambda d_j)$.

Proof is similar to that of Theorem 3.1 but significantly simpler. It follows from the trivial remark that the sequence: $G_0 := 1$,

$$G_j := e^{\lambda f_j} \prod_{i=1}^{j} (1 + e_i)^{-1}, \qquad j = 1, 2, \ldots$$

is a positive supermartingale.

Theorem 9.2. *Suppose that $f \in M_-$, $\|\|d_+^*\|\|_\infty \leq a$ $\|\|s_2\|\|_\infty \leq b$ for some $a > 0$, $b > 0$. Then for all $r \geq 0$,*

$$P(f_+^* \geq r) < \exp\left[\frac{r}{a} - \left(\frac{r}{a} + \frac{b^2}{a^2} \right) \ln\left(1 + \frac{ra}{b^2} \right) \right] < \left(\frac{eb^2}{ra} \right)^{r/a}.$$

Proof is quite similar to that of Theorem 3.4.

Theorem 9.3. *If $f \in M_-$, $p \geq 2$, $1 \leq c \leq p$, then*

$$|||f_+^*|||_p < c|||d_+^*|||_p + \sqrt{c}\, e^{p/c}|||s_2|||_p.$$

Proof. We use

Lemma 9.4. *(cf. Lemma 5.2.) If $\lambda > 0$, $\delta_1 > 0$, $\delta_2 > 0$, $\beta - 1 - \delta_2 > 0$, $f \in M_-$, then*

$$P(f_+^* > \beta\lambda, w_+^* \leq \lambda) \leq \varepsilon P(f_+^* > \lambda),$$

where

$$w_+^* = \left(\frac{d_+^*}{\delta_2}\right) \vee \left(\frac{s_2}{\delta_1}\right),$$
$$\varepsilon = \left(\frac{e}{N}\frac{\delta_1^2}{\delta_2^2}\right)^N, N = \frac{\beta - 1 - \delta_2}{\delta_2}.$$

Proof. Put $\bar{d}_j = d_j I\{d_j \leq \delta_2\lambda\}$, $\bar{f}_j = \bar{d}_0 + \cdots + \bar{d}_j$, $\bar{s}_{2,j+1} = \sum_{i=1}^{j+1} E_{i-1}\bar{d}_i^2$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mu &= \inf\{j\colon\ \bar{f}_j > \lambda\},\\
\nu &= \inf\{j\colon\ \bar{f}_j > \beta\lambda\},\\
\tau &= \inf\{j\colon\ \bar{s}_{2,j+1} > \delta_1\lambda\},\\
\bar{h}_j &= \bar{f}_{(j\wedge\tau\wedge\nu)\vee\mu} - \bar{f}_\mu, \qquad j = 0, 1, \ldots\ .
\end{aligned}$$

Then $(\bar{h}_j)$ is a supermartingale conditionally on F_μ, and

$$\begin{aligned}
P(f_+^* > \beta\lambda, w_+^* \leq \lambda) &= P(\bar{f}_+^* > \beta\lambda, w_+^* \leq \lambda)\\
&\leq P(\bar{h}_+^* > (\beta - 1 - \delta_2)\lambda)\\
&= EP(h_+^* > (\beta - 1 - \delta_2)\lambda \mid F_\mu)I\{\mu < \infty\}\\
&= \varepsilon P(\bar{f}_+^* > \lambda) \leq \varepsilon P(f_+^* > \lambda);
\end{aligned}$$

here, we put $\bar{h}_+^* = \max_j \bar{h}_j$ and took into account Theorem 9.2. The lemma is proved.

Now we can finish the proof of Theorem 9.3, which is similar to that of Theorem 5.1, but much simpler. Here, we do not need to use the Davis's decomposition and, therefore, we do not need to symmetrize; instead, we can apply Lemma 7.1 of Burkholder (1973) directly to f_+^*. These remarks complete the proof of the theorem.

Theorem 9.5. *Let $f \in M(\Re)$, $d_j = u_j - E_{j-1}u_j$, $\lambda > 0$, $Ee^{\lambda|u_j|} < \infty$, $j = 1, 2, \ldots$. Then for all $r \geq 0$,*

$$P(f_+^* \geq r) \leq \exp\left\{-\lambda r + \left|\left|\left|\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} e_j\right|\right|\right|_\infty\right\},$$

where $e_j = E_{j-1}(e^{\lambda|u_j|} - 1 - \lambda|u_j|)$. *If, besides,* $E_{j-1}u_j \geq 0$ *for all* $j = 1, 2, \ldots$, *then, moreover,*

$$P(f_+^* \geq r) \leq e^{-\lambda r} \left\| \prod_{j=1}^{\infty} (1 + e_j) \right\|_{\infty} .$$

Proof is analogous to that in Pinelis and Sakhanenko(1985). Observe that $e^u - u \leq e^{|u|} - |u|$, $u \in \Re$. *Hence,*

$$E_{j-1}e^{\lambda d_j} \leq (1 + e_j + \lambda E_{j-1}u_j)e^{-\lambda E_{j-1}u_j}.$$

Now the elementary inequalities

$$\begin{aligned} (1 + a + b)e^{-b} &\leq e^a \qquad (a \in \Re, b \in \Re), \\ (1 + a + b)e^{-b} &\leq 1 + a \qquad (a \geq 0, b \geq 0)_+, \\ E_{j-1}e^{\lambda d_j} &\leq e^{e_j}, \end{aligned}$$

and, if $E_{j-1}u_j \geq 0$,

$$E_{j-1}e^{\lambda d_j} \leq 1 + e_j,$$

$j = 1, 2, \ldots$, *if one chooses* $a = e_j$, $b = \lambda E_{j-1}u_j$. *Hence,*

$$\exp\left\{ \lambda f_j - \sum_{i=1}^{j} e_j \right\}, \qquad j = 1, 2, \ldots,$$

is a supermartingale and, if $E_{j-1}u_j \geq 0$, *so is*

$$e^{\lambda f_j} \prod_{i=1}^{j} (1 + e_i)^{-1}, \qquad j = 1, 2, \ldots .$$

It remains to use reasoning like that at the end of the proof of Theorem 3.1.

Remark. Martingales like those in Theorem 9.5 may arise, e.g., as a result of truncating and subsequent centering of the increments of other martingales. The aim of Theorem 9.5 is to provide for best constants in certain exponential inequalities for martingales, which cannot be reached via, e.g., the straightforward estimate $|d_j| \leq |u_j| + |E_{j-1}u_j|$. As illustration, let us give the following corollaries to Theorem 9.5, which are improvements of Theorems 3.3, 3.4, resp., for the particular case

$X = \Re$.

Theorem 9.6. *Suppose that* $f \in M(\Re)$, $d_j = u_j - E_{j-1}u_j$, $j = 1, 2, \ldots$, *and*

$$\left\| \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} E_{j-1}|u_j|^m \right\|_{\infty} \leq m!\Gamma^{m-2}B^2/2$$

for some $\Gamma > 0$, $B > 0$ *and* $m = 2, 3, \ldots$. *Then for all* $r \geq 0$

$$P(f_+^* \geq r) \leq \exp\left(-\frac{r^2}{B^2 + B\sqrt{B^2 + 2\Gamma r}}\right).$$

Proof is almost literally the same as that of Theorem 3.3, but rests upon Theorem 9.5, instead of Theorem 3.1.

Theorem 9.7. *Suppose that* $f \in M(\Re)$, $d_j = u_j - E_{j-1}u_j$, $j = 1, 2, \ldots$, *and* $|||u^*|||_\infty \leq a$, $\left|\left|\left|\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} E_{j-1}u_j^2\right|\right|\right|_\infty \leq b^2$ *for some* $a > 0$, $b > 0$. *Then for all* $r \geq 0$,

$$P(f_+^* \geq r) \leq \exp\left[\frac{r}{a} - \left(\frac{r}{a} + \frac{b^2}{a^2}\right)\ln\left(1 + \frac{ra}{b^2}\right)\right] < \left(\frac{eb^2}{ra}\right)^{r/a}.$$

Proof differs from that of Theorem 3.4 only in that we use Theorem 9.5 instead of Theorem 3.1.

If, instead of Theorem 9.5, we had used the "naive" estimate $|d_j| \leq |u_j| + |E_{j-1}u_j|$ and, say Theorem 3.1, we would have hardly been able to obtain inequalities better than ones like those in Theorems 9.6, 9.7 but with 2Γ, $2B$, $2a$, $2b$ in place of Γ, B, a, b, resp. The gain is quite significant. For instance, if

$$\exp\left(-\frac{r^2}{(2B)^2 + 2B\sqrt{(2B)^2 + 2(2\Gamma)r}}\right) = 10^{-1},$$

the bound in Theorem 9.6 varies from $10^{-2\sqrt{2}} < (1.5)10^{-3}$ (when Γr is much greater than B^2) to 10^{-4} (when B^2 is much greater than Γr).

10. Appendix.

Here, we find explicitly the constants obtainable in the mentioned preceding sections bounds due to Burkholder (1973) and Hoffmann-Jørgensen (1974) using their methods. Besides, we prove that, at least for the sums of independent random vectors in Hilbert spaces, the bound on moments found in Pinelis (1980) is equivalent to (5.1).

It follows from Theorems 15.1 and 21.1 of Burkholder (1973) that for $f \in M(\Re)$, $p \geq 1$,

$$|||f^*|||_p < c_p(|||d^*|||_p + |||s_2|||_p); \tag{10.1}$$

$$|||f^*|||_p < (c_2 + p)\left|\left|\left|\left(\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} d_j^2\right)^{1/2}\right|\right|\right|_p, \tag{10.2}$$

analysis of the methods of Burkholder shows that one can put

$$C_i = \inf\left\{\frac{\beta/\delta}{[1-i\beta^p\delta^2/(\beta-1-\delta)^2]^{1/p}}\colon\ \beta-1-\delta>0, \delta>0,\right.$$
$$\left. i\beta^p\delta^2/(\beta-1-\delta)^2<1\right\}, \quad i=1,2.$$

Proposition 10.1. *For $i=1,2$, $p\geq 1$, one has $C_i \asymp p$.*

Proof. Suppose that $\beta-1-\delta>0, \delta>0$, $i\beta^p\delta^2/(\beta-1-\delta)^2<1$, $i=1$ or 2. Then $\beta^{p-2}\delta^2<1$, and we see that $C_1>\beta/\delta>\beta^{p/2}$. If $\beta\geq 2$, then $C_1>2^{p/2}>p$. Assume now that $\beta<2$. Put $c=p\delta$, $k=(\beta-1-\delta)/\delta$. Then $\beta=1+(k+1)c/p\geq e^{(k+1)c/2p}$ since $1+\alpha>e^{\alpha/2}$ for $0<\alpha<1$. Hence, $1>\beta^p\delta^2/(\beta-1-\delta)^2=\beta^p/k^2\geq k^{-2}e^{(k+1)c/2}$, $c<4(k+1)^{-1}\ln k<4$, $\delta=c/p<4/p$; therefore,

$$C_1>1/\delta>p/4. \tag{10.3}$$

Conversely, $\beta\leq e^{(k+1)c/p}$ since $1+\alpha\leq e^{\alpha}$, and so, for $k=3$, $c=1/4$, one has $\beta\leq e$, $2\beta^p\delta^2/(\beta-1-\delta)^2=2\beta^p/k^2\leq 2e^{(k+1)c}/k^2<2/3$. Hence,

$$C_2\leq 3_\beta/\delta<3e/\delta=3ep/c=12ep. \tag{10.4}$$

Note that $C_1\leq C_2$. Now (10.3), (10.4) imply the proposition.

The method of Hoffmann-Jørgensen (1974) is based on the inequality

$$P(f^*\geq x+y+z)\leq P(d^*\geq y)+P(f^*\geq x)P(f^*\geq z), \tag{10.5}$$

where $x\geq 0, y\geq 0, z\geq 0$, $f\in M_{ind}(X)$, X is any separable Banach space. If $f\in M_{ind}(X)$, it is no loss of generality to assume that d_n's are symmetrically distributed. Let $0<\varepsilon<1$, $z_0=2|||f_n|||_1/\varepsilon$, $x=\alpha u$, $y=\beta u$, $z=\gamma u$, $u>0$, $\alpha>0$, $\beta>0$, $\gamma>0$, $\alpha+\beta+\gamma=1$. Then by the inequalities of Lévy (see, e.g., Kahane (1968)) and Tchebycheff

$$P(f^*\geq z_0)\leq 2P(\|f_n\|\geq z_0)\leq\varepsilon,$$

and (10.5) implies for $p\geq 1$,

$$|||f^*|||_p^p\leq\beta^{-p}|||d^*|||_p^p+\varepsilon\alpha^{-p}|||f^*|||_p^p+(z_0/\gamma)^p,$$

since for any random vector X,

$$|||X|||_p^p=\int_0^\infty p\lambda^{p-1}P(\|X\|\geq\lambda)d\lambda$$
$$\leq\lambda_0^p+\int_{\lambda_0}^\infty p\lambda^{p-1}P(\|X\|\geq\lambda)d\lambda,\quad \lambda_0>0.$$

Choosing now $\beta=\gamma=1/(4p)$, $\alpha=1-1/(2p)$, $\varepsilon=1/4$, we see that (6.5) is true with $c(p)=p$.

On the other hand, (10.5) is compatible with the assumption that $P(f^* \geq x) = e^{-x}$ for $x \geq 0$, and that $d^* \equiv 0$; in this case, $|||f^*|||_p = [r(p+1)]^{1/p} \asymp p = p|||f^*|||_1 = p(|||d^*|||_p + |||f_n|||_1)$. Thus, $C(p) = p$ is the best constant in (6.5) obtainable on the basis of (10.5).

Note that the inequality implies

$$|||f^*|||_1 \leq 2|||f_n|||_1 \leq 2|||f^*|||_1. \tag{10.6}$$

Now we can summarize what has been said about inequality (10.5) as

Proposition 10.2. *Let HJ stand for the class of all the triads $(f^*, \|f_n\|, d^*)$ of nonnegative random variables satisfying (10.5) for all $x \geq 0$, $y \geq 0$, $z \geq 0$ and also (10.6). Then for $p \geq 1$,*

$$\sup\left\{\frac{|||f^*|||_p}{|||d^*|||_p + |||f_n|||_1}\colon\ (f^*, \|f_n\|, d^*) \in HJ\right\} \asymp p;$$

here, of course, $f^*, \|f_n\|, d^*$ are mere symbols denoting arbitrary random variables, not necessarily related to a martingale, $|||f_n|||_1 := E\|f_n\|$.

Finally, we give an interpretation of results of Pinelis (1980). Let $\mathcal{F}(p)$, $p > 0$ stand for the set of all the pairs (c_1, c_2) that may be represented in the form

$$c_1 = \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} c_i(p) b_i^{-2i}/i!, \tag{10.7}$$

$$c_2 = \frac{\tilde{c}_m(p)}{m!} + \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} c_i(p) b_i^{p-2i-2}/c!, \tag{10.8}$$

where m is the integer part of $p/2$, $b_i > 0$,

$$c_i(p) = v(p-2i)2^{-i}(2i)!\binom{p}{2i}\prod_{k=0}^{i-1} u(p-2k), \tag{10.9}$$

$$\tilde{c}_m(p) = 2^{-m}(2m)!\binom{p}{2m}\prod_{i=0}^{m-1} u(p-2i), \binom{p}{k} = \frac{p(p-1)\dots(p-(k-1))}{k!}, \tag{10.10}$$

and $u(\cdot)$, $u(\cdot)$ are any functions such that

$$u(2) + v(2) \geq 1, u(2) > 0, v(2) > 0, \tag{10.11}$$

$$u(s) \geq 1, v(s) \geq 1 \quad \text{for} \quad s > 2, \tag{10.12}$$

$$u(s)^{\frac{1}{3-s}} + v(s)^{\frac{1}{3-s}} \leq 1 \quad \text{for} \quad s > 3; \tag{10.13}$$

the sum of the product of the empty set of numbers are considered to be and 1, resp. For $a_p > 0, a_2 > 0, p > 0$, put

$$B_{p,1980}(a_p, a_2) = \inf\{(c_1 a_p^p + c_2 a_2^p)^{1/p}\colon\ (c_1, c_2) \in \mathcal{F}(p)\}.$$

In Pinelis (1980), bounds on moments of martingales in Hilbert spaces with bounded conditional second moments were proved. If applied, in particular, to any $f \in M_{ind}(X)$, where X is any separable Hilbert space, the Corollary in Pinelis (1980) states that

$$|||f_n|||_p \le B_{p,1980}(S_p, S_2), \quad p > 0.$$

In turn, this implies (cf. Theorems 6.1, 7.1)

$$B_{p,ind,S}(a_p, a_2) \le 2B_{p,1980}(a_P, a_2) \tag{10.14}$$

for any $a_p > 0, a_2 > 0, p > 0$ and any separable Banach space X.

Proposition 10.3. *For $a_p > 0, a_2 > 0, p > 2$,*

$$B_{p,1980}(a_p, a_2) \asymp B_p(a_p, a_2).$$

In view of Theorem 7.1, any of the following functions: $B^X_{p,ind}, B_{p,ind,0}$, $B_{p,S}$, $B^X_{p,ind,S}$, $B_{p,ind,0,S}$, $\check{B}_p$, $\widehat{B}_p$ may be used here in place of B_p.

Proof. For $s \ge 0$, put

$$y_s = g_s(\alpha_s) = \max\{g_s(\alpha)\colon\ 0 \le \alpha \le 1\}, \qquad 0 \le \alpha_s \le 1, \tag{10.15}$$

and, for $s \ge 2$,

$$u(s) = e^3 y_s^s/(sq^2 y_{s-2}^{s-2}), \quad v(s) = 10^s y_2^{s-2}, \tag{10.16}$$

where (cf. (7.10))

$$g_s(\alpha) = (s\alpha + 1)^{1-\alpha/2} q^\alpha, q = a_2/a_p. \tag{10.17}$$

Note that for $s \ge 0$,

$$y_s \ge g_s(0) \vee g_s(1) = 1 \vee (s+1)^{1/2} q. \tag{10.18}$$

Besides, y_s is increasing in s because so is $g_s(\alpha)$. Hence, for $s \ge 2$, one has $u(s) \ge e^3 y_s^2/(sq^2) \ge e^3 > 1$, $v(s) \le 2 \cdot 10^s y_s^s/(1+q^2)$, $v(s) \ge (10^{s-3} y_s^{s-3}) \vee 1$, and so, for $s > 3$,

$$u(s)^{\frac{1}{s-3}} + v(s)^{\frac{1}{3-s}} \le [sq^2/(e^3 y_s^2)]^{\frac{1}{s}} + \frac{1}{10 y_s}. \tag{10.19}$$

Consider first the case $q \in I_s$, where I_s is defined by (7.13). Then,

$$y_s = g_s(\alpha_s) > e^{-1}(s\alpha_s + 1)$$

(cf. (7.15)), and, in view of (7.11),

$$\begin{aligned} q = q_s(\alpha_s) &< \sqrt{s\alpha_s + 1}\, \exp\left\{\frac{1}{2} - \frac{s}{s\alpha_s + 1}\right\} \\ &< \sqrt{y_s} e^{1 - s/(y_s e)}; \end{aligned}$$

hence

$$\left(\frac{sq^2}{e^3y_s^2}\right)^{\frac{1}{s}} < \left(\frac{s}{ey_s}\right)^{\frac{1}{s}} e^{-1/(y_se)} \le \exp\left\{\frac{1}{e^2y_s} - \frac{1}{ey_s}\right\} < 1 - \frac{1}{10y_s}$$

since $(s/a)^{1/s} \le e^{1/(ae)}$ for $a > 0$ and $e^{-\alpha} < 1 - \alpha/2$ for $0 < \alpha < 1$. Thus, (10.19) implies (10.13) if $q \in I_s$.

If $q < \min I_s = e^{-s}$, then $y_s = g_s(0) = 1$, and

$$\left(\frac{sq^2}{e^3y_s^2}\right)^{\frac{1}{s}} < \left(\frac{s}{e^3}\right)^{\frac{1}{s}} e^{-2} \le e^{e^{-4}-2} < e^{-1},$$

so that (10.19) implies (10.13).

Now suppose that $q > \max I_s (> [(s+1)/e]^{1/2})$. Then $y_s = g_s(1) = (s+1)^{1/2}q > s^{1/2}q$, and for $s \ge 3$, $\left(\frac{sq^2}{e^3y_s^2}\right)^{\frac{1}{s}} < e^{-3/s} < 1 - \frac{1}{s}$,

$$\frac{1}{10y_s} = \frac{1}{10\sqrt{s+1}\,q} < \frac{\sqrt{e}}{10(s+1)} < \frac{1}{s},$$

so that (10.19) implies (10.13).

Thus, $u(s)$ and $v(s)$ defined by (10.16) satisfy (10.11)-(10.13). Let us write $\mathcal{E}_1 \ll \mathcal{E}_2$ if $\mathcal{E}_1^{1/p} < \mathcal{E}_2^{1/p}$, $p > 2$.

Using (10.9), (10.16), (10.18) and the Stirling's formula, we see that for $p > 2$, $i = 1, \dots, m-1$,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{c_i(p)}{i!} &\ll y_p^p y_{p-2i}^{-2} q^{-2i} \ll y_p^p (1+q)^{-2} q^{-2i} \\ &\le y_p^p q^{-2pi/(p-2)}; \end{aligned} \tag{10.20}$$

similarly, (10.10), (10.16), (10.18) imply

$$\frac{\tilde{c}_m(p)}{m!} \ll y_p^p q^{-2m} y_{p-2m}^{-(p-2m)} \le y_p^p q^{-p}. \tag{10.21}$$

Choose $b_i = q^{-p/(p-2)}$ so that $b_i^{-2i} a_p^p = b_i^{p-2i-2} a_2^p$, $i = 1, \dots, m$, in accordance with (10.17); then (10.7), (10.8), (10.20), (10.21), (10.15), (7.12) yield

$$(c_1 a_p^p + c_2 a_2^p)^{1/2} < y_p a_p = \check{B}_p.$$

Thus, $B_{p,1980}(a_p, a_2) < \check{B}_p(a_p, a_2)$. It remains to recall (10.14) and Theorem 7.1.

References

1. Bennett, G. (1962). Probability inequalities for the sum of independent random variables. J. Amer. Statist. Assoc. **57** 33-45.
2. Berger, E. (1991). Marjorization, exponential inequalities and almost sure behavior of vector-valued random variables. Ann. Probab. **19** 1206-1226.
3. Bernstein, S. (1924). Sur une modification de l' inéqualité de Tchebichet. Annals Science Institute Sov. Ukraine, Sect. Math. I.
4. Billingsley, P. (1968). Convergence of probability measures. John Wiley, New York.
5. Burkholder, D. (1966). Martingale transforms. Ann. Math. Statist. **37** 1494-1504.
6. Burkholder, D. (1973). Distribution function inequalities for martingales. Ann. Probab. **1** 19-42.
7. Chung, K.L. (1951). The strong law of large numbers. Proc. Second Berkeley Symp. Math. Statist. Prob. 341-352. Univ. of California Press.
8. Davis, B. (1970). On the integrability of the martingale square function. Israel J. Math. **8** 187-190.
9. de Acosta, A. (1981). Inequalities for B-valued random vectors with applications to the strong law of large numbers. Ann. Probab. **9**, 157-161.
10. Dharmadhikari, S.W., Fabian, V. and Jogdeo, K. (1968). Bounds on the moments of martingales. Ann. Math. Statist. **39** 1719-1723.
11. Dharmadhikari, S.W. and Jogdeo, K. (1969). Bounds on moments of certain random variables. Ann. Math. Statist. **40** 1506-1508.
12. Hall, P. and Marron, J.S. (1987). Choice of kernel order in density estimation. Ann. Statist. **16** 161-173.
13. Hitczenko, P. (1990). Best constants in martingale version of Rosenthal's inequality. Ann. Probab. **18** 1656-1668.
14. Hitczenko, P. (1991). Private communication.
15. Hoeffding, W. (1963). Probability inequalities for sums of bounded random variables. J. Amer. Statist. Assoc. **58** 13-30.
16. Hoffmann-Jørgensen, J. (1974). Sums of independent Banach space valued random variables. Studia Math. **52** 159-186.
17. Johnson, W.B., Schechtman, G. and Zinn, J. (1985). Best constants in moment inequalities for linear combination of independent and exchangeable random variables. Ann. Probab. **13** 234-253.

17a. Kahane, J.-P. (1968). Some random series of functions. Heath, Lexington, Mass.

17b. Kallenberg, O. and Sztencel, R. (1991). Some dimension-free features of vector-valued martingales. Probab. Th. Rel. Fields **88** 215-247.

18. Kwapień, S. and Szulga, J. (1991). Hypercontraction methods in moment inequalities for series of independent random variables in normed spaces. Ann. Probab. **19** 369-379.
19. Kwapień, S. and Woyczyński, W.A. (1989). Tangent sequences of random variables: Basic inequalities and their applications. Proc. Conf. on Almost Everywhere Convergence in Probab. and Ergodic Theory, 237-265. Academic, New York.

20. Marcinkiewicz, J. and Zygmund, A. (1937), Sur les fonctions independantes. Fund. Math. **89** 60-90.
21. Nagaev, S.V. and Pinelis, I.F. (1977). Some inequalities for the distributions of sums of independent random variables. Theory Probab. Appl. **22** 248-256.
22. Pinelis, I.F. (1974). On some inequalities for the distributions of sums of independent random variables. Diploma work. Novosibrisk State University. (Russian).
23. Pinelis, I.F. (1978). Distributions of sums of independent random variables with values in a Banach space. Theory Probab. Appl. **23** 608-615.
24. Pinelis, I.F. (1980) Estimates of moments of infinite-dimensional martingales. Math. Notes **27** 459-462.
25. Pinelis, I.F. (1981). Limit theorems on large deviations for sums of infinite-dimensional random variables when the Cramér's condition is violated. Manuscript deposited at All-Union Institute for Scientific and Technical Information (VINITI), no. 164-81. (Russian).
26. Pinelis, I.F. (1986). Probability inequalities for sums of independent random variables with values in a Banach space. Math. Notes **39** 241-244.
27. Pinelis, I. (1992). An approach to inequalities for the distributions of infinite-dimensional martingales.
28. Pinelis, I. (1992). On a majorization inequality for sums of independent random vectors. Submitted.
29. Pinelis, I.F. and Sakhanenko, A.I. (1985). Remarks on inequalities for large deviation probabilities. Theory Probab. Appl. **30** 143-148.
30. Pinelis, I.F. and Utev, S.A. (1984). Estimates of the moments of sums of independent random variables. Theory Probab. Appl. **29** 574-577.
31. Pinelis, I.F. and Utev, S.A. (1989). Exact exponential bounds for sums of independent random variables. Theory Probab. Appl. **34** 340-346.
32. Rosén, B. (1970). On bounds on the central moments of even order of a sum of independent random variables. Ann. Math. Statist. **41** 1074-1077.
33. Rosenthal, H.P. (1970). On the subspaces of $L^p(p > 2)$ spanned by sequences of independent random variables. Israel J. Math. **8** 273-303.
34. Sazonov, V.V. (1974). On the estimation of moments of sums of independent random variables. Theory Probab. Appl. **19** 371-374.
35. Talagrand, M. (1989). Isoperimetric and integrability of the sum of independent Banach-space valued random variables. Ann. Probab. **17** 1546-1570.
36. Whittle, P. (1960). Bounds for the moments of linear and quadratic forms in independent random variables. Theory Probab. Appl. **5** 302-305.
37. Yurinskii, V.V. (1974). Exponential bounds for large deviations. Theory Probab. Appl. **19** 154-155.